

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 7, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 7-12 and 14 to better conform with U.S.P.T.O. practice and procedure. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

I. Specification

The Examiner objected to the disclosure for containing grammatical informalities. Applicant has amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner. Consequently, Applicant requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 12 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 12 and 14 and indicated above. Consequently, Applicant believes that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claim 12 and 14 have been addressed, therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 7-9 and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bannai et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0208525).

Claim 1 recites:

"A method for realizing an end-to-end connection between a client layer connected to an Resilient Packet Ring (RPR) network

and a client layer connected to a Multi Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) network, the method comprising:

interconnecting the RPR network and the MPLS network through a Transparent LAN Service (TLS) layer."

Bannai is directed to a system and method for providing transparent LAN services over a ring network. See Abstract. As illustrated in Bannai Fig. 2, a ring network 200 includes multiple rings 212, 214 and 102. Within for example, ring 102, are domains A and B which are transparent LAN services domains. See para.[0026]. Further, an endpoint device of domain A may send a data packet to another endpoint device of domain A using a multicast MPLS protocol.

However, Bannai discloses at most a single ring network 200 including multiple rings. At no point does Bannai disclose a network other than the ring network 200, let alone a Multi Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) network, as claimed. Consequently, Bannai does not teach a method for realizing an end-to-end connection between a client layer connected to a Resilient Packet Ring (RPR) network and a client layer connected to a Multi Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) network, as claimed.

Further, although Bannai discloses that domains A and B are TLS domains each associated with a multiple MPLS label, there is no teaching or suggestion that a Transparent LAN Service layer interconnects an RPR network and an MPLS network. Bannai merely discloses an endpoint device in domain A may send a data packet to another endpoint device of domain A of the ring network using a MPLA protocol.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. To the extent claim 8 recites similar elements, it should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bannai et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0208525).

Claim 3 recites:

"...in the direction from RPR to MPLS:

encapsulating received client frames in TLS packets, indicating the final destination;

encapsulating the TLS packets in RPR packets and passing the encapsulated TLS packets to the MPLS network;

wherein the TLS packets become MPLS packets and travel in the MPLS network until the final destination;

in the direction from MPLS to RPR:

encapsulating received client frames in MPLS packets, indicating a Label Switched Path (LSP) that has to be followed up to the final destination;

switching the MPLS packets inside the MPLS network and then passing the switched MPLS packets to the TLS network, becoming TLS packets;

encapsulating the TLS packets in RPR packets and wherein the encapsulated PLS packets travel in the RPR network, until the final destination."

The Examiner concedes that the elements of claim 3 are not explicitly disclosed in Bannai, however, the Examiner asserts that Bannai provides a clear suggestion for performing the claimed steps. As indicated above, Bannai is not at all concerned with the interconnection between an RPR network and an MPLS network. Consequently, Bannai is not at all concerned

with the encapsulating and switching of packets from an RPR network to an MPLS network as claimed. Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, modifying Bannai to teach the claimed elements would not be obvious to one of skill in the art.

Further, the Examiner asserts that para. [0046] of Bannai teaches the claimed elements. However, the aspect of Bannai cited by the Examiner discloses that a TLS microcode 422 looks up a destination MAC address of an incoming packet in an association table. If the destination MAC address is not found in the association table, then the TLS microcode 422 appends to the incoming packet the broadcast MAC address and the multicast MPLS label of an associated TLS domain.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion regarding the transmission of packets in the direction from an RPR network to and MPLS network and vice versa, let alone any discussion regarding the encapsulation and switching of packets until reaching a final destination.

For at least the above reasons, claim 3 and dependent claim 4 should be deemed allowable.

V. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 5-6 and 10-11 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. At the present time, Applicant has not rewritten claims 5-6 and 10-11 in independent form since Applicant believes claims 5-6 and 10-11 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 7, 2007